

February 20, 1976

that the thing you do is wrap it in a velvet glove, but the thinnest of the velvet when that fist winds up against your jaw or the side of your head prevents any cushioning of the impact, and if you only look at the package that the fist is wrapped in, then you could think it is something very pleasant, something very beautiful, that when it caresses you it will give you very pleasant sensation to your skin, but with the force that the fist is going to be delivered with is going to do great damage to you. Then you wake up a few days later, and if you can orient yourself, you realize somebody ran a gain down on you. Senator Lewis and his cohorts are running a gain down on the Legislature today. They want to tell you that religion has nothing to do with it. If we were talking about schools that had nothing to do with religion, there would be no need to put into this that the money has to go exclusively for nonsectarian purposes. Why won't Senator Lewis be totally honest since he is talking about elevating this thing and not dealing with subterfuge and religious hatred and prejudice and so forth. It is in his power to clean up his amendment but he wants to leave the door open for the religious schools to be supported. Let him amend his bill to say that the only students who can receive public money are those going to nonsectarian schools but he doesn't want to do that because he knows there are a lot of schools in this state that people go to that are connected with religions. None of these schools are going to advocate a position contrary to their religion even when my good friend, Senator Mahoney. I just happened to see him so I will use him as an example. If Senator Mahoney would decide to come to me and try to convert me to catholicism, he would say, Ernie, let's you and I sit down and reason together. I would say, fine, let's reason. He'd say, now we are going to discuss this issue. I'd say, fine, let's discuss it. He'd say, now, we will take both sides of it. We are going to consider the pros and the cons. Well, not having been born yesterday and having watched the way religious people operate, I know good and well what his conclusion is going to be, so regardless of what he says at point A where he starts, I know what he is going to say when he gets to point Z so all the other letters in between mean nothing. We know good and well that whenever somebody with a particular religious point sets out to discuss the issue objectively, he or she is going to be anything but objective. It is going to be an argument in behalf of that particular position. History can be manipulated to this purpose. Biology and zoology can be manipulated to this purpose. An example could be abortion or artificial birth control. From the standpoint of biology an argument might be made to show that artificial birth control is contrary to nature, so on a strictly biological basis, you might can show that birth control of an artificial kind is wrong. You should let everybody multiply and replenish the earth to whatever extent they choose or are capable physically of doing and according to the principles of nature that rule animal kingdom, the survival will occur for those that are most fit, but when you inject other considerations, sociological, philosophical, ecological, you might begin to find reasons